

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action mailed August 21, 2006 rejected claims 1-12. This is a full and timely response to that outstanding Office Action. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1-12 are pending. More specifically, claims 1 and 7 are amended. These amendments are specifically described hereinafter.

I. Present Status of Patent Application

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Wasilewski, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,782). To the extent that these rejections have not been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims, they are respectfully traversed.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

A. Claims 1-6

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Wasilewski, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,782). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A method for providing a program in a conditional access system, the method comprising the steps of:
 - selecting a digital bit stream from a plurality of digital bit streams;
 - encrypting the selected digital bit stream according to a first encryption method to provide a first encrypted stream;
 - encrypting the selected digital bit stream according to a second encryption method to provide a second encrypted stream wherein the second encryption method is different from the first encryption method;***
 - multiplexing the first encrypted stream, the second encrypted stream, and the plurality of digital bit streams to provide a partially-encrypted stream; and
 - transmitting the partially-encrypted stream.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose the features emphasized above. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. Phillips Petroleum Co.*, 849 F.2d 1430, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that *Wasilewski* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least **encrypting the selected digital bit stream according to a second encryption method to provide a second encrypted stream wherein the second encryption method is different from the first encryption method**. Therefore, *Wasilewski* does not anticipate independent claim 1, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least that reason.

For at least the reason that independent claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 2-6 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 2-6 contain all the features of independent claim 1. Therefore, since dependent claims 2-6 are patentable over *Wasilewski*, the rejection to claims 2-6 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-6 recite further features and/or combinations of features, as are apparent by examination of the claims themselves, that are patently distinct from the cited references of record. Hence, there are other reasons why dependent claims 2-6 are allowable.

B. Claims 7-12

The Office Action rejects claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Wasilewski, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,782). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 7, as amended, recites:

7. A method for providing a plurality of programs in a conditional access system, the method comprising the steps of:
- selecting a plurality of elementary bit streams from a transport stream;
 - encrypting a portion of the selected elementary bit stream according to a first encryption method to provide a first encrypted stream;
 - encrypting the portion of the selected elementary bit stream according to a second encryption method to provide a second***

encrypted stream wherein the second encryption method is different from the first encryption method;

multiplexing the first and second encrypted streams and the remaining portion of the selected elementary bit stream with the transport stream; and
transmitting the multiplexed stream.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose the features emphasized above. For a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose, teach, or suggest all elements/features of the claim at issue.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 7, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that *Wasilewski* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least **encrypting the portion of the selected elementary bit stream according to a second encryption method to provide a second encrypted stream wherein the second encryption method is different from the first encryption method.**

Therefore, *Wasilewski* does not anticipate independent claim 7, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least that reason.

For at least the reason that independent claim 7, as amended, is allowable over the cited references of record, dependent claims 8-12 (which depend from independent claim 7) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that dependent claims 8-12 contain all the features of independent claim 7. Therefore, since dependent claims 8-12 are patentable over *Wasilewski*, the rejection to claims 8-12 should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of independent claim 7, dependent claims 8-12 recite further features and/or combinations of features, as are apparent by examination of the claims themselves, that are patently distinct from the cited references of record. Hence, there are other reasons why dependent claims 8-12 are allowable.

III. Miscellaneous Issues

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-12 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those which may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

/BAB/

Benjamin A. Balser, Reg. No. 38,962

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500